

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,391	11/25/2003	Marcus Felipe Fontoura	ARC920030080US1	8873
7590 10/18/2006		EXAMINER		
Frederick W.		ONI, OLU	ONI, OLUBUSOLA	
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC Suite 304			ADTIBUT	DADED MUMDED
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2568-A Riva R	• •	2168	2168	
Annapolis, MD 21401			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/723,391	FONTOURA ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		OLUBUSOLA ONI	2168		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHOWHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/25 This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ser No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2168

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Application, filed on 11/25/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter because, this claims contains a software component, however it is a computer software per se. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Art Unit: 2168

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an applicati

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lindblad et al. (Pub No U.S 2005/0055343) hereinafter "Lindblad".

For claim 1, Lindblad teaches "a method for parsing documents in query processing, said method comprising: producing at least one index of a document written in a mark-up language; corresponding said index to said document" (See paragraph [0227]) "scanning said document" (See paragraph [0129], [0160], [0174])

Art Unit: 2168

"selectively skipping portions of said document based on instructions from said index"(See paragraph [0107])

For claim 2, Lindblad teaches "wherein said mark-up language comprises any of HTML and XML" (See paragraph [0007]-[0009], [0031-0032])

For claim 3, Lindblad teaches "wherein the skipped portions of said document comprise portions irrelevant to said query" (See paragraph [01029], [0107])

For claim 4, Lindblad teaches "wherein said index comprises a plurality of elements representing textual categories of said query" (See paragraph [0082]-[0227])

For claim 5, Lindblad teaches "wherein said instructions match said elements to said query" (See paragraph [0082]-[0227])

For claim 6, Lindblad teaches "wherein if said elements do not match said query, then said parser uses said index to skip the portions of the document corresponding to unmatched elements" (See paragraph [0129]-[0107])

For claims 7 and 8, Lindblad teaches "wherein said each of said elements corresponds to a position ..." (See paragraph [0008-0009]-[0031], [0157-0158])

Art Unit: 2168

For claim 9, Lindblad teaches "wherein said index uses said end position as a marker for determining where to resume scanning said document upon skipping said portions of said document" (See paragraph [0129], [0174])

For claim 10, Lindblad teaches "wherein said elements comprise sub-elements representing textual sub-categories of said query" (See paragraph [0082]-[0227])

For claim 11, Lindblad teaches "wherein said sub-elements updates said position in said document upon skipping said portions of said document and resuming scanning of said document" (See paragraph [0129], [0174])

For claims 12, Lindblad teaches "saving said textual categories into a buffer" (See paragraph [0082], [0104], [0130], [0226], [0083]).

For claims 13-24, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-12 and are similarly rejected.

For claims 25-36, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-12 and are similarly rejected.

For claim 37, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2168

Conclusion

4. The following prior art cited on the PTO-892 form, not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 7.30-5.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBP

OLUBUSOLA ONI

Examiner

Art Unit 2168

TIM VO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100